

REMARKS

Applicants have reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated July 22, 2008 (“the Office Action”). Claims 26-65 are currently pending. Claims 26, 31, 32, and 42 have been amended. No new matter has been added with the amendments to the claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 42-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,781,909 to Logan et al. (“*Logan*”) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,286,029 B1 to Delph (“*Delph*”). To the extent the rejections remain applicable to the claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 42 recites, in part, “receiving pages from the remote server..., displaying the pages in the list in a substantially continuous loop, using the pages stored in the local cache, until a new list of pages is received, and receiving a notice of a change to the list of pages during display of pages in the list in a substantially continuous loop.” Applicants respectfully submit that it has not been shown how either *Logan* or *Delph*, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest receiving a notice of a change to the list of pages during the display of the pages in the list, while the pages are displayed in a substantially continuous loop.

Logan discloses a kiosk management system that displays pages. The Office Action asserts that the “transition list” of *Logan* teaches a list of pages to be displayed in a repeating sequence. Office Action at pp. 4-5. *Logan* teaches that the “transition display mechanism 113...provides a mechanism for displaying one or more display pages to the user before the information identified by the requested URL is displayed.” (*Logan* at col. 6, ll. 15-25.) In short, the *Logan* kiosk “transitions” from a first display page to the page requested by the user, by displaying these transition pages as a lead up to the ultimate display of the requested page. *Logan* teaches that when the kiosk display units are idle (i.e., when a session for displaying pages has ended), “the display unit makes use of the idle time to perform housekeeping information transfers.” (*Id.* at col. 18, ll. 35-40; *see also id.* at col. 19, ll. 34-67.) Specifically, the *Logan* system takes advantage of the idle state to “verify the integrity of stored files against

the remote originals.” (*Id.* at col. 18, ll. 47-57; col. 19, ll. 34-67.) This involves sending “if-modified-since” messages as well as retrieving modified versions of the pages for storage at the remote display devices. (*Id.* at col. 18, ll. 47-57; col. 19, ll. 48-59.) Accordingly, *Logan* does not teach performing these tasks while pages are displayed. Additionally, and as noted in the Office Action, *Logan* also fails to teach displaying a sequence of pages in a substantially continuous loop, let alone receiving a notification of a change to the transition list as the transition list displays in a substantially continuous loop. Office Action at p. 5.

Applicants respectfully assert that *Delph* fails to resolve the deficiencies of *Logan*. It has not been shown how *Delph* teaches “receiving a notice of a change to the list of pages during display of pages in the list in a substantially continuous loop.” For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that the *Logan-Delph* combination fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 42. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 42.

Claims 43-45 depend from claim 42. In light of the grounds set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 43-45 also be withdrawn.

Claim 46 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan* and *Delph* in further view of *Stone*. Claim 46 depends from Claim 42. It has not been shown how *Stone* overcomes the deficiencies of the *Logan-Delph* combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is improper for at least the same reasons articulated regarding Claim 42.

Claims 26-27, 29-30, 47-49, 51, and 58-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,948,066 to Whalen et al. (“*Whalen*”) in further view of *Delph*. To the extent the rejections remain applicable to the claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and all assertions therein.

Claim 26 recites limitations similar to the limitations in independent claim 42. In particular, Claim 26 recites, in part, “receiving pages from the remote server..., displaying the pages in the list in a substantially continuous loop, using the pages stored in the local cache, until a new list of pages is received, [and] receiving a notice of a change to the rotation set during display of the rotation set pages in a substantially continuous loop.”

Applicants respectfully assert that *Whalen* fails to resolve the deficiencies of *Logan-Delph* combination. It has not been shown how *Whalen* teaches “receiving a notice of a change to the rotation set during display of the rotation set pages in a substantially continuous loop.” For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that the *Logan-Delph-Whalen* combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 26.

Claims 27, 29-30, 47-49, 51, and 58-60 depend from claim 26. In light of the grounds set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 27, 29-30, 47-49, 51, and 58-60 also be withdrawn.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan* in view of *Whalen* and *Delph* in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0078134 A1 to Stone et al. (“*Stone*”). Claim 28 depends from Claim 26. It has not been shown how *Stone* either by itself or in combination with *Logan*, *Delph*, and/or *Whalen* overcomes the deficiencies of the *Logan-Delph-Whalen* combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is improper for at least the same reasons articulated regarding Claim 26.

Claims 31-32 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0046299 to Lefebvre et al. (“*Lefebvre*”), *Logan*, *Whalen*, and *Delph* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,311,187 B1 to Jeyarman et al. (“*Jeyarman*”). Applicants respectfully disagree that the claims are unpatentable over the cited art.

Claim 31 recites limitations similar to the limitations in independent Claims 26 and 42. In particular, Claim 31 recites, in part, at least one display device adapted to “receiving a notice of the change in the stored data during display of the rotation set pages in a substantially continuous loop.” As stated in the Office Action, *Lefebvre* does not teach “display[ing] each page...in the predetermined sequence repeatedly in a substantially continuous loop until a new rotation set is received, [t]ransmit[ing] the request for the page containing the changed data, [and] [r]eceive[ing] the page containing the changed data.” Office Action at p. 16. Additionally, it has not been shown how *Lefebvre* teaches “receiving a notice of the change in the stored data during display of the rotation set pages in a substantially continuous loop.” It has also not been

shown how *Jeyarman* overcomes the deficiencies of the *Lefeber-Logan-Whalen-Delph* combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 31, as well as dependent Claims 32 and 39, is improper and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber, Logan, Whalen, Delph, and Jeyarman* in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0084124 A1 to Su et al. ("*Su*").

Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber, Logan, Whalen, Delph, and Jeyarman* in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0005129 A1 to Scheinkman ("*Scheinkman*").

Claims 38 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber, Logan, Whalen, Delph, and Jeyarman* in further view of SearchSecurity.com, pages 1-3, published Oct. 5, 2000 ("*SearchSecurity.com*").

Claim 40 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber, Logan, Whalen, Delph, and Jeyarman* in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0039776 A1 to Ballard ("*Ballard*").

Claims 33-38 and 40-41 depend from Claim 31. It has not been shown how *Su, SearchSecurity.com, Scheinkman, or Ballard* either by themselves or in combination overcome the deficiencies of the *Logan-Lefeber-Delph-Whalen-Jeyarman* combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 33-38 and 40-41 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are improper for at least the same reasons articulated regarding Claim 31.

Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan, Whalen, and Delph* in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0016839 to Smith et al. ("*Smith*").

Claims 52-53, 55, and 63-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan, Whalen, and Delph* in further view of *Lefeber*.

Claim 54 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan, Whalen, Delph, and Lefeber* in further view of *Smith*.

Claims 56-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan, Whalen, Delph*, and *Ballard* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,985,950 to Hanson et al. ("*Hanson*").

Claims 61-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan Whalen*, and *Delph* in further view of *Ballard*.

Claims 50, 52-57, and 61-65 depend from Claim 26. It has not been shown how *Smith, Lefeber, Stone, Ballard*, or *Hanson* either by themselves or in combination overcome the deficiencies of the *Logan-Delph-Whalen* combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 50, 52-57, and 61-65 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are improper for at least the same reasons articulated regarding Claim 26.

Request for Interview

If the present Application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained or made final, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner before issuing any further action, and further requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule a telephone conference.

CONCLUSION

Any circumstance in which the Applicants have (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the Applicants concede other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the Applicants concede any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

In view of the above, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully submit that the Application is in condition for allowance, and requests such a Notice.

No additional fees are believed due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or required fees or any credits to deposit account 05-0765, referencing the attorney docket number 14012-052001/50-02-056.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 22, 2008

/J. Kyle Komenda/

J. Kyle Komenda

Reg. No. 56,556

PTO Customer No. 26230

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street, Suite 5000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 292-4055
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091